

Remarks

The Office Action mailed July 20, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-21 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claim 21 is newly added. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Holmes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,749) is respectfully traversed.

Holmes et al. describe a system for providing wireless protocol capability. The system includes a Bluetooth device (126) that may be an on-board computer (column 4, lines 5-10). The system also includes a Bluetooth module that may also contain circuitry, including a processor, to facilitate an exchange of communication signals between the Bluetooth device and a wireless phone (110) (column 5, lines 7-10). For example, the Bluetooth module may include a capability to translate information from the Bluetooth protocol to a format compatible with the wireless phone (column 5, lines 10-13). The Bluetooth module is included within a vehicle adaptor (104) that is connected to a main cord (108) (column 4, lines 65-66, column 5, lines 21-22).

Claim 1 recites a method for manufacturing, the method comprising “providing a central processing unit (CPU) configured for a programmable logic controller (PLC) including a PLC module bus for coupling at least one PLC module to the CPU; providing a means for wireless radio frequency communications; and operationally coupling the means for wireless radio frequency communications to the CPU, wherein the CPU is mounted on a backplane of a rack, wherein the means and CPU communicate without using the PLC module bus.”

Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest a method for manufacturing as recited in Claim 1. Specifically, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest operationally coupling the means for wireless radio frequency communications to the CPU, where the CPU is mounted on a backplane of a rack, where the means and CPU

communicate without using the PLC module bus. Rather, Holmes et al. describe facilitating an exchange of communication signals between a Bluetooth device and a wireless phone via a Bluetooth module that contains a processor, translating information from the Bluetooth protocol to a format compatible with a wireless phone, and connecting a vehicle adaptor, including the Bluetooth module, to a main cord. A description of the Bluetooth device, the Bluetooth module, the vehicle adaptor, and the main cord does not teach the backplane and the rack as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest operationally coupling the means for wireless radio frequency communications to the CPU that is mounted on a backplane of a rack. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Holmes et al.

Claims 2-6 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-6 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 3, Applicants submit that Claims 2-6 likewise are patentable over Holmes et al.

Claim 7 recites a method for communicating, the method comprising “providing a wireless communication device; sending a wireless message from the wireless communication device to a programmable logic controller (PLC) having a central processing unit (CPU) and a PLC module bus for coupling at least one PLC module to the CPU; and operationally coupling a means for wireless radio frequency communications to the CPU, wherein the CPU is mounted on a backplane of a rack, wherein the means for wireless radio frequency communications and CPU communicate without using the PLC module bus.”

Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest a method for communicating as recited in Claim 7. Specifically, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest operationally coupling a means for wireless radio frequency communications to the CPU, where the CPU is mounted on a backplane of a rack, where the means for wireless radio frequency communications and CPU communicate without using the PLC module bus. Rather, Holmes et al. describe facilitating an exchange of communication signals between a Bluetooth device and a wireless phone via a Bluetooth module that contains a processor, translating information from the Bluetooth protocol to a format compatible with a wireless phone, and connecting a

vehicle adaptor, including the Bluetooth module, to a main cord. A description of the Bluetooth device, the Bluetooth module, the vehicle adaptor, and the main cord does not teach the backplane and the rack as recited in Claim 7. Accordingly, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest operationally coupling a means for wireless radio frequency communications to the CPU that is mounted on a backplane of a rack. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 7 is submitted to be patentable over Holmes et al.

Claim 8 depends from independent Claim 7. When the recitations of Claim 8 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 7, Applicants submit that Claim 8 likewise is patentable over Holmes et al.

Claim 9 recites a Programmable Logic Controller comprising “a backplane comprising at least one module connector; a central processing unit (CPU) card mounted on said backplane; and a transmitter/receiver mounted on said CPU card, said transmitter/receiver operationally coupled to said CPU, wherein said CPU is mounted on said backplane via said CPU card.”

Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest a Programmable Logic Controller as recited in Claim 9. Specifically, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest a transmitter/receiver mounted on the CPU card, the transmitter/receiver operationally coupled to the CPU, where the CPU is mounted on the backplane via the CPU card. Rather, Holmes et al. describe facilitating an exchange of communication signals between a Bluetooth device and a wireless phone via a Bluetooth module that contains a processor, translating information from the Bluetooth protocol to a format compatible with a wireless phone, and connecting a vehicle adaptor, including the Bluetooth module, to a main cord. A description of the Bluetooth device, the Bluetooth module, the vehicle adaptor, and the main cord does not teach the backplane as recited in Claim 9. Accordingly, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest the transmitter/receiver operationally coupled to the CPU that is mounted on the backplane via the CPU card. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 9 is submitted to be patentable over Holmes et al.

Claims 10-14 depend from independent Claim 9. When the recitations of Claims 10-14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 9, Applicants submit that Claims 10-14 likewise are patentable over Holmes et al.

Claim 15 recites an apparatus comprising “a processor; a radio frequency receiver operationally coupled to said processor; a radio frequency transmitter operationally coupled to said processor, said transmitter is configured to send a wireless message to a programmable logic controller (PLC) having a central processing unit (CPU) and a PLC module bus for coupling at least one PLC module to the CPU; and means for wireless radio frequency communications operationally coupled to the CPU, wherein the CPU is mounted on a backplane of a rack, wherein the means and CPU communicate without using the PLC module bus.”

Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest an apparatus as recited in Claim 15. Specifically, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest means for wireless radio frequency communications operationally coupled to the CPU, where the CPU is mounted on a backplane of a rack, where the means and CPU communicate without using the PLC module bus. Rather, Holmes et al. describe facilitating an exchange of communication signals between a Bluetooth device and a wireless phone via a Bluetooth module that contains a processor, translating information from the Bluetooth protocol to a format compatible with a wireless phone, and connecting a vehicle adaptor, including the Bluetooth module, to a main cord. A description of the Bluetooth device, the Bluetooth module, the vehicle adaptor, and the main cord does not teach the backplane and the rack as recited in Claim 15. Accordingly, Holmes et al. do not describe or suggest means for wireless radio frequency communications operationally coupled to the CPU that is mounted on a backplane of a rack. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 15 is submitted to be patentable over Holmes et al.

Claims 16-20 depend from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 16-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that Claims 16-20 likewise are patentable over Holmes et al.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

Newly added Claim 21 depends from independent Claim 9, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance and is patentable over the cited art. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is also patentable over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



William J. Zychlewicz
Registration No. 51,366
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070